



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Symonds' *Southward Bound* sets off the similar method of Tennyson's *Daisy*, the former notable for a fine summary of Italian pagan tendencies. We agree with Professor Mead in seeing in Milton's sonnet, *On the late massacre in Piedmont*, little that is essentially Italian. Miss Phelps, who has contributed some good translations of her own to the collection, has in a prefatory sonnet given a happy turn to Browning's invocation "Oh woman country, wooed not wed," in recalling some feminine figures in Italian romantic legend, that introduce a delicate expression of Italian yearning. And we owe to her an inclusion of some masterly poems that escaped the other collections: here, for instance, Pembr's *Per gl'occhi almeno non v'è clausura*, for Perugia. In this we have confronted the mournful temper of Tuscan monasteries that recalls death, and the beauty of nature that invites to life—the theme of Carducci's Gothic Church. So her unique citation from Sir Rennel Rodd, *The Unknown Madonna*, presents a fine specimen of what Ruskinian criticism would be in verse. These observations could be carried to great length: as a testimony to the independence of Miss Phelps' method and the keenness of her judgment, which avoids the trite and is not blinded to the excellence of little known verse, not sanctified by cant, or the glamor of some great name. Her work is a labor of love, that finds its expression through scholarly channels.

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Cornell University.

The Authorship of Timon of Athens. By ERNEST HUNTER WRIGHT, Ph. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1910, pp. ix, 104. (Columbia University Studies in English.)

In his monograph on *Timon of Athens*, Dr. Wright makes a new examination of the evidence bearing on the various problems of authorship, and from this evidence and a study of the previous critical theories evolves a definite hypothesis concerning the play. The problems include the question of the sources of the plot, the theory of double authorship and the division of the play between the two writers, the relation of Shake-

spere's part to that of the other playwright, and the reconstruction of the original *scenario*. Dr. Wright emphatically favors the theory that Shakespeare was the first of two authors, not working in collaboration.

In considering the question of the sources Dr. Wright traces the successive appearances of the misanthropic Timon in literature from the period of the Peloponnesian War to the publication of the Shakespearean play. The scattered bits of Timon legend thus collected present no source which merits the term in the degree shown by the older *King John* or the *Taming of a Shrew*. It is conjectured, however, that source material was found in the Lives of Antony and Alcibiades in North's *Plutarch* and probably in the repetition of this sketch of Antony in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, in the academic play of Timon produced about 1600,¹ and perhaps in Lucian's dialogue, *Τίμων ἡ Μισάνθρωπος*. Dr. Wright is not inclined to believe in a lost source; and of the two possibilities about which there has been disagreement among critics he accepts the academic comedy and questions Lucian. The latter might have been known to Shakespeare and his contemporaries in either an Italian or a French translation, and the spirit of the tragedy rather resembles that of the Greek dialogue than that of the earlier Elizabethan versions of the Timon story. Nevertheless the relation between Lucian and *Timon of Athens* seems to Dr. Wright unproved and unnecessary. In concluding that the Timon comedy was a source, he reinforces a recent attempt² to demonstrate that the neglect of the academic production in this connection is not deserved, since this comedy alone supplies certain striking features of the plot and it is by no means impossible that it should have been known to Shakespeare.

The theory of double authorship is determined *de novo* by an exposition of the æsthetic contrasts and incongruities in technic and of the divergences in the characterization and the general structure of the play. These points are readily established. By use of the *criteria* thus gained, Dr. Wright proceeds to add one more to the numerous attempts

¹ *Shakspeare Society Transactions*, 1842.

² *Princeton University Bulletin*, vol. xv, no. 4, pp. 208-223.

at a separation of the work done by the two playwrights. In this case, however, the employment of several *criteria*, the restricted use of the purely æsthetic test, and the constant examination of previous ascriptions compel particular consideration for his conclusions. Dr. Wright takes Mr. Fleay's "division of the strata" in 1874³ as a convenient norm. Compared with Mr. Fleay's results, this new separation transfers some five hundred lines to Shakespeare and fifteen to the other author.⁴ The more important differences between the two results are Dr. Wright's transfer to Shakespeare of the first two scenes of act three and also of the few lines printed as prose near the end of the second scene of act two,⁵ with the striking exception of nine words⁶ in the midst of this passage. From this separation of the work done by the two playwrights it appears that the hand of the non-Shakespearean author is found chiefly in the first three acts, and that the last two belong mainly to Shakespeare.

From the problems thus investigated Dr. Wright passes to the question of the priority of Shakespeare's work in the composition of *Timon of Athens*. This eminently satisfactory conclusion—which removes from Shakespeare's shoulders much of the responsibility for the play as it now stands—is supported by more detailed arguments than have hitherto been brought together. These are, very briefly, that the passages which in the division of the strata have been labeled as spurious are either additions to the Shakespearean portions or, as in the development of the part of Ventidius and in the motivation of Alcibiades, subversions of the plot as indicated in the authentic passages; that the use of each incident furnished by the source material appears in a scene which is credited to Shakespeare; and that, conversely, the development of the play in the spurious scenes is nowhere essential to the work of the master playwright.

Having presented this case for Shakespeare's priority, Dr. Wright returns to his division of

the strata in order to determine the original *scenario*. The outline of the story as presented by the work of Shakespeare indicates a tolerably clear plot foundation, but leaves several evident lacunae in construction and motivation. Dr. Wright does not attempt to conjecture Shakespeare's own intentions concerning these gaps.⁷ But he is able to form some estimate of the second author's intelligence and skill from his bungling efforts to fill in the omissions thus defined. This estimate, however, unfortunately fails to throw any light on the mooted question of the name of the interpolator. Dr. Wright accepts 1607-8 as the date of Shakespeare's work, and is persuaded that the unknown second author revamped *Timon* for the stage before 1623.

As is well known, the general theory of Shakespeare's priority in the composition of the play has had, in more recent years, the support of a majority of scholars. Dr. Wright strengthens this hypothesis both by critical revision of former arguments and by some additions of his own. Of his own contributions to the discussion the most significant starts from his division of the strata, but has its chief bearing in indicating that the work of the non-Shakespearean writer was in the nature of interpolation and, perhaps, alteration. For, having judged on æsthetic and technical grounds that the first two scenes of act three are Shakespearean and that the third scene is not, Dr. Wright notes that plot threads from the three scenes are to be found in the short prose passage near the end of scene two of the second act. In fact, several other plot threads are discovered to be entwined in this passage. But the threads from un-Shakespearean work (such as that from the refusal of Sempronius in scene three of the third act) are observed in the nine words, "I hunted with his honour to-day: you to Sempronius," and those from passages ascribed to Shakespeare (such as from scenes one and two of the third act) are visible in the remainder of the prose context. The nine words are therefore judged to be un-Shakespearean; and, being removed, the rest

³ *New Shakspere Society Transactions*, 1874, pp. 130-194.

⁴ It is not noted by Dr. Wright that a later experiment by Mr. Fleay—given in a brief statement in the *Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare*, 1886, p. 243—approaches much nearer to his figures.

⁵ II, 2, 195-203.

⁶ II, 2, 197-8.

⁷ In this connection a study, perhaps of more interest than value, might be made of the half-dozen later efforts to complete or adapt Shakespeare's work. F. W. Kilbourne gives a list of such attempts in *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare*, pp. 133-141.

of the passage falls nicely into the blank verse of the adjoining lines of the scene. This feat of textual criticism, which has some bearing on most of the problems considered, probably had its origin in a characteristically sane comment by Dr. Furnivall⁸ on Mr. Fleay's 1874 paper on "*Timon*." But for the complicated piece of detective work involved in following up that clue we are indebted to Dr. Wright. It is to be regretted that he has not shown evidence of similar minute interpolations into the Shakespearean work.⁹ In the main his ascriptions are *en bloc*, not *en detail*. Moreover, the further conclusion that the rejected Sempronius scene was written to replace an original Ventidius scene planned and prepared by Shakespeare, though attractive, can hardly be accepted as more than a possibility.

As a whole, the book will be useful as a summary of much of the previous critical work on *Timon of Athens*. Moreover, Dr. Wright's keen sifting of his material, and his energetic and yet circumspect method of presenting his conclusions, both new and old, combine to make this monograph a forceful and commendable piece of work. There are details which will doubtless invite further revision, and the identification of the second playwright is still an important problem; but the matter of the relation of the two authors would seem now to be satisfactorily established.

HARRY CLEMONS.

Library of Princeton University.

Anthology of French Prose and Poetry, by WILLIAMSON UPDIKE VREELAND and RÉGIS MICHAUD. Boston, Ginn and Company, 1910. 12mo., iv-325 pp.

There has been a tendency of late years in France to restrict anthologies to either poetry or prose, and in many cases the period represented has been limited to a century or even a half-century.¹ Such anthologies seem more coherent and

less elementary than the somewhat haphazard compilations of prose and poetry for school use described by Marcel Prévost as "*morceaux choisis, très mal choisis*." This criticism has been so frequently justified that it is with some apprehension that one takes up a new anthology intended for use in American schools and colleges.

In their preface Messrs. Vreeland and Michaud give the following reasons for publishing a work of this nature for American use: "In the French anthologies, published in France, we have found that in some cases the selections are too scrappy for American students and for American methods of instruction; in other cases some of the best and most familiar passages are omitted for the good reason that they are generally known by all French youths; and in still other cases the volumes are so burdened with selections from writers of minor importance, or else so critical that they seem to form a disconnected history of the literature rather than to be the representative passages of important writers." It is this appreciation of the needs of the American student that has enabled the editors to compile an anthology which will be warmly received by French teachers, especially those who are giving outline courses in the history of French literature for which apt illustrations are absolutely necessary if the student is to take away anything except a dry enumeration of facts.

To include in one volume selections of representative prose and poetry of the last three centuries is a difficult task, and the editors have added to their labors by including examples of the dramatic literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Belgian authors, Fonsny and Van Dooren, in the preface to their *Prosateurs français*, excuse the omission of dramatic material by saying: "On verra qu'il n'est rien de plus difficile à détacher qu'une scène d'une œuvre dramatique. Tout fait corps ici, et ce n'est pas un extrait, mais plutôt un arrachement, quelque chose comme une amputation, une opération chirurgicale que l'on ferait." We are grateful to Messrs. Vreeland and Michaud for proving that so delicate an operation can be successfully performed, and certainly the selections from the comedies of Marivaux, Beaumarchais, Musset, and Augier, preceded by short notes, are by no means disconnected mutilations, but rather

⁸ *New Shakspeare Society Transactions*, 1874, pp. 243-4.

⁹ Indeed this might, perhaps, have been done. With due hesitation I suggest II, 2, 1-8, and IV, 1, 37-40, as among such possibilities.

¹ Pelissier, *Anthologie des prosateurs français*, Paris, Delagrave, 1910; Gautier-Ferrières, *Anthologie des écrivains français*, Paris, Librairie Larousse, 1909.